DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 731 JC 850 517

AUTHOR Hayes, Robert M.
TITLE Los Angeles Community Colleges Library Development Program.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE 10 Dec 84
NOTE 16p.; For a related document, see JC 850 516.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Community Colleges; *Library Administration; *Library Automation; *Library Personnel; *Library Planning; Library Research; *Library Services; Personnel Evaluation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Designed as a supplement to the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Libraries' review of their current situation, this report presents an assessment of administrative support and staffing of the libraries in the LACCD, and offers recommendations for maintaining and improving their operations. Following introductory comments on the purposes of the evaluation, initial issues of concern are identified and discussed, including: (1) instructional support; (2) faculty support; (3) information skills; (4) student support; (5) internal operations; and (6) administrative organization. The report also identifies important areas that were not covered by the study. After presenting the schedule of meetings with district library staff, an assessment is provided of the overall value of the libraries, financial support, administrative support, and staffing. Recommendations concerning administration, staffing, and automation are followed by a potential 5-year development program for the libraries. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261731

Los Angeles Community Colleges

Library Development Program

A Report from

Robert M. Hayes

Consultant

to the

Los Angeles Community College District

10 December 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Koltai

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 850 517

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGES

LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A Report from

Robert M. Hayes, Consultant

10 December 1984

This is the Report from Robert M. Hayes, Consultant to the Los Angeles Community College District with respect to District library plans and programs. It supplements and is based on the Report prepared by the District Library Steering Committee, which is attached.

CONTEXT

The activities covered by these two Reports were specified by the initial charge to me, as the Consultant, which was stated as follows:

1. To attend meetings with District administrators, faculty, and library staff to assess the current situation of libraries in the Los Angeles Community College District.

2. To assist the District steering committee and the campus-based library committees in the definition of the issues and the gathering of information. The outcome of these committee effort should be a series of discussion papers on library mission, library policy, library needs and library goals for the future. The papers should become the basis for discussion at a District-wide Library Seminar in Fall 1984.

3. To provide the District with professional judgment of future trends in library services and the programmatic activities the District should undertake to meet challenges ahead.

It is important to note that it was absolutely essential, in my view, that the librarians of the District be responsible for the preparation of the "discussion papers". They will be the persons who will need to deal with the problems in implementation of any program, so they should be the ones who define what that program should be. My approach therefore was to meet extensively with them, in the context of an initial definition of topics to be covered by the discussion papers.

THE ISSUES OF CONCERN

The initial definition of topics was as follows:

- Instructional Support
- Faculty Support

- o Information Skills
- o Student Support
- o Internal Operations
- o Administrative Organization

These were accepted by the District Library Steering Committee and by the District administration as a suitable basis for proceeding with the study by the librarians.

The attached Report from the District Library Steering Committee deals directly with these issues. The following is a detailed discussion of the sense in which each of these issue areas was considered, more or less as originally defined by a report from me to the librarians.

Instructional Support

This I saw as the first priority program area. It is the one most central to the responsibilities of the library as the tool for support of classroom instruction. Included are needs for materials and equipment that will provide direct support to the curriculum -- books, media, equipment, study facilities, professional library services.

The program goals and objectives are likely to vary from college to college, reflecting the curricular programs of each. The program plan will need to relate library resources and services directly to those curricular programs. The resources and development schedule will need to have clear justification in terms of the instructional program of each college, with the total program then growing from the separate college programs.

Faculty Support

To an extent, this program area is directly related to the primary one of instructional support, but there are independently important goals and objectives that can be identified. Specifically, faculty need assistance in the development of their courses, in the integration of them into the total curriculum, in their own academic and professional research and development.

The goals and objectives in this program area may vary from campus to campus, but there is the possibility that they may better be defined across the system as a whole, especially in support to faculty research and academic development. The program plan may therefore arise not from the needs on the individual colleges but from system-wide needs for faculty development. The resources and time schedule, in that event, would be determined for the system as a whole rather than arising from consolidation of needs on each campus.

Information Skills

This program area, more than the others, may reflect simply my own view of the challenges and opportunities; however, I hope that it will stimulate the thoughts of the librarians concerning the potential role of the library as an active agent in the educational program in addition to its role in the support to the general instructional program.

Specifically, it has been pointed out in numerous reports that the U.S. has become an "information society", an "information economy". Usually, this development is identified with the increasing importance of the technologies for information processing and communication -- the microcomputer, television,

satellite communication. However, it is clear that we are dealing with a far more basic change and that the real need is to provide students with a wide range of what I'm calling "information skills". They include skills such as reading, writing, use of libraries, use of computers and terminals, use of communication systems, use of media, use of information industries, use of governmental sources of information.

Many of these skills are the clear objectives of the general instructional program, in which the library serves an important supportive role. But all of them can also be combined into a specific, library-based program, aimed at the development of these informational skills as generic capabilities, valuable in and supportive of each course.

I see the goals and objectives in this program area as clearly system-wide though there may be campus-specific ones as well. I see the program itself as growing out of a combination of library-based objectives and course-based objectives. I see the resource needs being established on a system-wide basis, in the context of recognition at the State level of the need to support the future development of California's "information-based economy".

Student Support

This program area reflects the goal of making the library as information center an important part of the life of the students, beyond simply the formal educational program.

Internal Operations

This program area is, in one sense, derivative from the others; it thus recognizes that the several services of the library require such operations as selection and acquisition of materials and equipment, cataloging to assure that materials are accessible, service functions, etc. The goals in this program area are therefore management goals, oriented toward effective service and economic operation.

The program plan has considered the potential use of automated means for support to the internal operations, for reasons of economy, effectiveness, or improvement in services. It will require strong justification, based on the other program areas. It may be closely related to specific campus programs but it is more likely to reflect needs of the system as a whole, incorporating system-wide operational support.

Administrative Organization

The final program area derives in part from the prior ones and in part from the needs to review the option for administrative organization of the libraries as a whole. Currently, the college libraries are administered as part of each individual campus. A question explicitly posed from the outset was whether there should be centralization of library administration at the District level, especially for program areas that cut across all campuses.

Whichever combination of centralized/decentralized administration may be appropriate, the goal is to assure that libraries serve the needs of the system, the instructional program, the faculty, and the students in the most effective and economic fashion. The program plan may well recommend a series of administrative changes, even experiments, over time.

WHAT WAS NOT COVERED BY THE STUDY

It is important to identify what was not covered by the study, either by the librarians or by me, as Consultant.

- o There was not an evaluation of automation as such, except peripherally
- o There was not an assessment of collections
- o There was not an assessment of acquisitions policies and practices
- o There was not an assessment of library technical services and operations
- o There was not an assessment of library personnel, their qualifications or performance

These are all exceptionally important issues, usually considered in a survey of a library or group of libraries. Presumably the District will want to undertake a study at some time that explicitly addresses them.

However, in this Report I will make specific comment concerning two of these issues. First, automation is a matter of central concern to the future planning of the District. I will therefore make recommendations concerning further steps toward an evaluation of appropriate alternatives; furthermore, I will express my own considered professional view of some aspects of the current automated system and the potential for use of microcomputers.

Second, while there was not a charge to assess personnel, I must record my personal admiration for the professional librarians in the District. They are exceptionally dedicated, and the District is fortunate indeed to have such a cadre of professionally qualified staff with a deep sense of commitment to the academic programs of the District. They have been faced with traumatic conditions that would discourage anyone, and they have indeed been discouraged. But they have continued to meet their obligations with true professionalism.

TIME SCHEDULE & ACTIVITIES

In conformance with the first charge, I met with District administrators, campus administrators, faculty library committees, and the librarians on each of the nine campuses. The following is the schedule of meetings:

	Librarians	Faculty & Administration
District	20 July	29 March
	30 August	6 July
	29 November	13 July
		13 August
City College	16 August	11 September
East LA College	16 August	11 September
Harbor College	15 August	15 August
Mission College	27 August	13 September
Pierce College	29 August	
South West College	17 August	
Trade Tech College	27 August	
Valley College	21 August	29 August
West College	28 August	28 August

In parallel to these meetings, the District librarians formed working groups, one for each of the programmatic areas identified above. They worked throughout the Summer and delivered a draft report, mailed to me on 4 October. Due to my own schedule of prior commitments, involving travel outside Los Angeles, I was not able to edit those draft reports until the end of November.

The resulting Draft Report was submitted to the District Library Steering Committee and to Dr. Cedric Sampson on 10 December 1984, along with a Draft of this Report.

MY OWN ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT STATUS

In this assessment, I am going to focus on the libraries of the District, but I urge that the term "library" be interpreted in the broadest possible frame of reference, including media collections and equipment, computer-aided instructional equipment and programs, language and learning laboratories, and similar instructional support programs. While most of my time was devoted to discussion with the librarians, as such, and most of the data I acquired and will present in this report relate to the libraries, it was evident that the same picture holds true for the full range of such facilities.

Overall Assessment

My overall assessment is that the libraries of the District are a vital and necessary component of the academic programs. This assessment is based on the discussions with librarians, administrators, and faculty. But it is confirmed by other assessments of the role of libraries in academic programs. I refer specifically to the report, published in 1984, by the Department of Education: Alliance for Excellence. Librarians Respond to A Nation at Risk. It clearly identifies recommendations and strategies concerning libraries and "the Learning Society".

In this context, the District is exceptionally fortunate in two respects:

- There is a dedicated, capable, committed professional staff, of which the District should be exceptionally proud
- There is a sizeable capital investment in buildings, facilities, library collections, media collections, media equipment

Assessment of Financial Support

These positive factors, though, are about to be overwhelmed by the negative ones. The libraries of the District are, in my view, which is consistent with the Report from the librarians, in a state of near disaster. In saying that, I recognize the conditions faced by the District as a whole. There are severe financial stresses posed by the combination of dramatic reductions in funding from State and local government, declining enrollments, contractual commitments to maintenance of staff, and the need to maintain the physical plant in usable condition. Of necessity, the District has been forced to cut in areas where cutting was possible, even though not best in the long run. Furthermore, as is natural in any near crisis situation, the District has felt the need to centralize much of the decision-making process in order to ensure that overall programmatic objectives would be met.

There is near catastophic understaffing, as I will document later in this Report. There are serious deficiencies in the maintenance of equipment, buildings, and other parts of the substantial capital investment; if this continues to be the case, the capital facilities will become unusable and be effectively lost. Frankly, to risk the loss of literally millions of dollars invested in the existing equipment and buildings in the interests of saving the comparatively insignificant costs for maintenance is foolish. Yet that is clearly what is happening.

In addition, the cutbacks in funding for acquisitions and for student staffing have serious effects upon the ability of the libraries to meet their programmatic objectives. Collections have clearly become dated; reference materials, especially, are losing current coverage; periodical collections are being reduced. The problems in obtaining student workers has meant that either books returned from use are long delayed for subsequent use or that expensive library professional and classified staff must be used inefficiently to do work easily done by student staff.

Assessment of Administrative Support

I found very mixed evidence concerning the extent to which the libraries are regarded as important. The administrations of each campus appear to have different views of their libraries and of the priority within the campus programs. Some campuses have faculty "library committees"; others do not. Some campuses have augmented the minimum allocations provided by system-wide decisions; other have not. Some campuses seem to see the libraries as essential components of the academic process; others seem to regard them as counterparts of the high school "study hall". Some campuses manage the informational support resources (i.e., the "library" broadly taken) as a unified whole; others manage them as separate, independent operations.

Even at the District level, my assessment is that there are mixed views of the importance of the libraries. The fact that this study was undertaken is, of course, very positive evidence. On the other hand, the librarians view District-centered management of the libraries with considerable fear. In part, that reflects their experience when the District was a part of the Unified School District, and they feel that many of the policies and practices that were operative in that context still prevail. It will require effort to eliminate that "dead hand of history".

Of special concern during the past Summer (during which this study was conducted) were administrative decisions with respect to library staffing, and especially for student hourly staff. The centralization of the process of hiring students created severe dislocations at the most critical times of the school year.

Assessment of Staffing

As I have pointed out, the quality of the professional, certificated staff is excellent, overall. My assessment, though, is that the number of them, of classified staff, and of student and other hourly support staff is less than it should be for efficient, effective operation of these resources. In support of that assessment, I refer first to the Report from the librarians, which documents in detail the problems. Beyond that, I can refer to such problems as the following:

- Libraries have had to be closed at hours in which they would have been of most value to the students, simply because the staff were not available to keep them open.

- For major portions of the academic program, evening and weekend classes, especially, media equipment and related instructional software have been either unavailable or required extensive efforts on the part of faculty to make them available.

Beyond this kind of anecdotal evidence, I can provide more quantitative bases for my assessment. There are, for example, various standards for staff

estimation, and I would urge the District and the librarians to examine the staff levels in comparison with those standards. Instead, though, I will draw on my own published basis for estimating staffing levels needed for library operations. These are called "work load factors"; they were first published in The Handbook of Data Processing for Libraries some fifteen years ago. They are based on the detailed examination of well over one hundred libraries throughout the country, done over a period of more than twenty-five years. They reflect actual practice and thus the pragmatic balance of work loads with resources. In the years in which I have used them, repeatedly they have provided reasonably accurate estimates of necessary staffing levels; any significant difference between those estimates and actual staffing has always reflected serious difficulties.

The work load factors measure the staff in terms of "direct labor" which is the time required for the actual carrying out of the defined work load. To the direct time must then be added time for four additional, non-direct time costs which are essential part of the staffing:

1) Supervision. This is clearly necessary in any operational organization.
2) Clerical support to supervision and administration. This is also clearly necessary for such aspects of operation as correspondence, procedural control, maintenance of administrative files, etc.
3) Benefit time. Holidays, vacation weeks, sick leave and similar benefit times are all essential, even contractual additions to the direct time.
4) Unallocated time. This represents time for meetings of staff, for professional activities, for the necessary participation in the academic adminstration of the institution.

Figure 1, following, presents the results of applying the work load factors (shown in the matrix, associated with each function) to the work load of the libraries of the District in those aspects related to internal operations and circulation of materials. Beyond those, I have included an arbitrary, but I think rational, estimate for the staffing required, at a minimum, to meet the reference and teaching functions of the professional, certificated staff. Figure 1 compares the resulting totals with the actual staffing for two years ago and for last year. The degree of understaffing is evident and dramatic.

I should point out that the work load estimates are for last year, when the amount of acquisitions of book and periodical was substantially less than it had been or than is needed to support the academic program. If the amount of acquisitions were at the level needed, the technical processing staff estimates should be comparably increased.

Finally, I should also point out that the estimate for reference and instructional activities (at 2 FTE professional, certificated staff per library) is clearly minimal. It barely assures coverage of the necessary services and doesn't begin to meet the wider needs represented by "information skills", for example.

RECOMMENDATIONS

My recommendations fall into three major categories: 1) administrative, 2) staffing, and 3) automation.

Figure 1. Work Load Factor Estimates of Staffing

		Professional	Clerical	Students
Acquisition (10,000 titles)				
Selection	.25/1000	2.5		
Acct'g	.40/1000		4.0	
Catalog (10,000 titles)				
Professional	.34/1000	3.4		
Maintenance	.25/1000		2.5	
Circulation (500,000 items)				
Records	.06/1000		30.0	
Shelving	.04/1000			20.0
Periodicals (4,000 titles)				
Records	.10/1000		4.0	
Receiving	.10/1000			4.0
Processing (15,000 volumes)				
Label, handle	.08/1000			1.2
Sub-total (Tech Services)		5.9	40.5	25.2
Reference & Teaching		18.0		
Sub-Total (Direct Time)		23.9	40.5	25.2
Supervision, Clerical, and Unallocated Direct				
of Professional Staff		4.0		
of Clerical Staff		7.0		
of Student Staff			4.3	
Sub-Total (Direct + Overhead)		34.9	44.8	25.2
Benefits Time (@ .15)		5.2	6.7	
Total FTE Required		40.1	51.5	25.2
Actual 1983/84 Staffing		29.1	44.0	unknown

To compare with the staffing in 1981/82, it must be recognized that the level of acquisition at that time was substantially greater (by a factor of perhaps 1.5 to 2.0). That would have resulted in the following estimates, based on the work load factors:

Total FTE Required	45.0	56.0	25.0
Actual 1981/82 Staffing	43.0	56.0	10.0

Administrative Recommendations

Recommendation 1. I recommend that there be formal "library committees" on each campus, made up of faculty members, librarians and media staff, and administration. Each should be chaired by a faculty member other than a librarian. The Chairman of the library department should be ex officio a member, but other certificated library staff should be members as well. Service on this committee should not be regarded as justifying "released time" from other responsibilities, any more than is the case with other faculty/administrative committees.

My reasons for this recommendation should be evident, but I will list them here. If the library indeed is an integral part of the campus academic program, it is essential that the faculty regard it so and that they participate actively in the determination of needs, activities, and priorities. A faculty library committee provides the means for visibility, for faculty input, and for dialogue among faculty, library staff, and administration.

Recommendation 2. There should be a person at the Vice-Chancellorial level in the District-wide administration with formal responsibility for overview of library plans and policies.

Just as campus visibility and policy determination justifies campus overview, the total library resources of the District are of a magnitude and importance fully justifying continuing attention at the level of central District administration. I do not see this as a requiring the full-time efforts of a single person; rather it should be simply one among the various responsibilities of one person. The areas of concern for that person would include staffing, budgeting, acquisitions, equipment and facilities. Some of them would require definition of policies; some, coordination among campuses; others, District-wide projects.

Recommendation 3. There should NOT be any centralization at the District level or at sub-regions within the District of the technical processing of library and/or media acquisitions. Instead, those technical processes should continue to be handled at each campus.

First, by "technical processing" I mean: 1) acquisition of materials (including selection, ordering, and receiving), 2) cataloging of materials (including both original cataloging, copy cataloging, and catalog maintenance), 3) circulation of materials. My reasons for recommending against centralizing these operations relate to both costs and effectiveness. The only reasons for centralizing these processes would be either reduction in costs, through economies of scale or through sharing of resources, or improved effectiveness. I find absolutely no evidence suggesting that there would be economies of scale; in fact, the likelihood of centralization would be added costs and duplication of staff (since each library would almost certainly need to continue its own record-keeping). With respect to effectiveness, it is clear that centralization would add delays in processing and would reduce the degree of responsiveness to campus needs and priorities. Perhaps most important is that centralization would reduce the campus responsibilities, both in the library and in the campus administration.

Recommendation 4. The District should establish a long-range plan for development of the libraries of the District covering at least the next five-year period.

Although it was not explicitly included in the charge for this study, I have from its beginning regarded the establishment of a five-year program for development of the libraries of the District as the primary objective. It seems to me essential that such a plan be the ultimate outcome. I have therefore included as part of this Report a starting point for consideration by the administration, faculty, and librarians of the District.

Staffing Recommendations

Recommendation 5. There should be a concerted effort by the librarians, the campus administrators, and the District-wide administration to establish standards for library staffing with respect to both technical processing, reference service, and teaching responsibilities.

In the attached Report from the librarians, the current under-staffing and its deleterious effects have been well documented. In this Report from me, I have tried to provide quantitative evidence of the degree of it. However, these Reports should be considered, along with other criteria such as established standards, on a broad basis by the District administration.

Recommendation 6. There is clear need for a formal program of library staff development in order to provide the District librarians with means for continuing education, for the exchange of information, and for maintenance of staff professional qualifications.

I think the value of this recommendation is evident. The question is how it can be accomplished. I would be pleased to have a formal arrangement between the District and its librarians, on the one hand, and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at UCLA, on the other, to create a program for District library staff development, if such an approach seemed appropriate to the District.

Automation-Related Recommendations

Recommendation 7. I recommend that the District NOT regard automation of its libraries as a means for solution of the District's problems. Instead, it should be regarded as an augmentation of the services of the libraries.

This recomendation is in recognition of a continuing theme that will be found in the literature to the effect that "automation will eliminate the need for books, for libraries, and for librarians". Articles and books talk about the "paperless society" and about the pervasive effects of the computer on society. I am urging the District to view that literature with a very jaundiced eye. My own professional assessment is that the computer-based technologies are not replacing any of the prior ones; they are simply adding new capabilities and responsibilities.

Recommendation 8. I recommend that the District NOT extend the operation of the CLSI system, currently installed at West, to the District at large.

My reasons are that the CLSI system currently installed is far less than an effective system. It is based on obsolete technology and dated approaches. Extending it to other campuses would require major investments in the conversion of files, in the installation of equipment, and in the conversion of operating procedures. It would involve substantial increases in telecommunication costs with no compensating savings. Now, many of the costs of investment would be incurred in the installation of other automated systems, but there is no reason to incur them with an obsolete,

dated system.

There is one serious problem raised by this recommendation. Currently, the costs of the system at West are far greater than appropriate for its needs. That's in part because the system was presumably configured to service more than just the West campus; in part it's because the system itself is now an inefficient one. The District will need to determine how to handle those costs at West without deleterious effects on that campus.

A related problem arises if the CLSI system at West were replaced by a newer system. It is essential that the investment represented by the cataloging data base not be lost. In principle, it should not be, since the records are in machine-readable form and should be readily transferred to other computer systems. In fact, though, there may be difficulties in retrieving those records from the CLSI data base.

Recommendation 9. I recommend that the District undertake a concerted study of the alternative means for automating library internal operations to the aim of selecting appropriate systems.

My own assessment is that a microcomputer based, distributed system is most appropriate for the District to consider. Stand alone equipment on each campus, at an inexpensive level, could provide effective and economic means for circulation control, for ordering, for serial records, and for management. However, there has not been the time in this study to do the necessary systems analysis and evaluation for either confirmation of that assessment or for determination of the best alternatives. I recommend strongly that the District undertake the necessary systems study.

POTENTIAL FIVE-YEAR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The following is a potential five-year program for development of the libraries of the District. I present it not as a recommended program but as a starting point for discussion by administration, faculty, and librarians of the District. My aim is to provide a framework for that discussion, with initial parameters that will make it sufficiently concrete.

There are three dimensions for the five-year program, as I will present it. The first is the time dimension; it will be represented by the current year and five subsequent years over which the program plan will be considered. The second is the categories of expenditure; they include staff, acquisitions, equipment, automation, and services. The third, and most important, is programmatic; it is represented by the six program areas defined at the beginning of this Report. Schematically:

The Time Dimension	The Expenditure Dimension	The Programmatic Dimension
Current	Staffing	Instructional Support
1985/86	Acquisitions	Faculty Support
1986/87	Equipment (non-computer)	Information Skills
1987/88	Automation (and computers)	Student Support
1988/89	Contract Services	Internal Operations
1989/90		Administrative Organization

For simplicity in presentation, I will formulate the program plan around the programmatic dimension, with the other dimensions providing the structure for details.

Any development program implies the allocation of resources -- money, staff, capital investment. If the current crisis in funding continues, the library development program would compete for scarce resources with other components of the academic program in general. Even if added funds become available, it will still compete, though with less critical effects. Such additional funding might be the result of increased enrollment, of augmented general State or local funding, of funding for special programs. In any event, I have made no effort to adjust the program plan I will present to fit the current or potential future funding context or to relate it to competing program needs. It is presented in terms of its own objectives. Therefore, the recommended review of the program plan by administration, faculty, and librarians should consider not only the programmatic goals of the libraries as such but their relationship to the overall programmatic goals of the District and the realities of funding levels.

I will present the program plan in terms of dollars, for consistency in the presentation. They are derived from the underlying estimates for staff, acquisitions, equipment, etc. They are expressed in terms of 1984 dollars, with no factor for inflation. However, I must record that the numbers presented are largely hypothetical. Nowhere in the documentation provided is there a consolidated budget for the libraries on any campus or for the District as a whole. The budgets for library staff are incorporated with those for all certificated salaries or non-certificated salaries for each campus; the budgets for "books" (and presumably other library acquisitions) are incorporated with supplies. I have therefore had to base estimates on gross averages for salaries, benefits, acquisitions, etc. using my own rules of thumb. The review by District administration and librarians therefore should regard these data at most as indicative and should correct them as necessary to reflect actual costs rather than hypothetical ones.

Instructional Support

This program area relates primarily to the level of acquisitions and related costs in internal operations and equipment. The past few years have seen a significant erosion in the ability of the library to support the instructional program as a result of the reductions in both acquisitions and staffing. The cornerstone of any library development program must therefore be the establishment of the level of acquisitions and associated staffing necessary to support the instructional program.

Beyond the restoration of staffing and acquisition levels, the supporting equipment is in a state of serious deterioration. There are literally millions of dollars worth of capital investment in library and audiovisual materials that will be destroyed unless a planned program of maintenance and replacement is instituted.

At the least, this means restoration of the levels that existed prior to the current financial crisis. Given no other input, I must assume that such a level of support will meet the objectives. If so, the question is the time period over which to plan for restoration. I am projecting a two-year period for that, followed by a steady-state thereafter. Hence:

	Current	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1978/89	1989/90
Staffing	$1,400 K	$1,600 K	$1,800 K	$1,800 K	$1,800 K	$1,800 K
Acquisitions	300 K	450 K	600 K	600 K	600 K	600 K
Equipment (non-computer)		250 K	500 K	500 K	500 K	500 K
Total	$1,700 K	$2,300 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K

Faculty Support

I see no dramatic additional requirements for resources to meet this programmatic area. I recognize that the Report from the Librarians at several times identified the need for additional staffing to provide "faculty liaison". That may be necessary, but my own assessment is that this program area ought to be well covered by both the internal processing (selection of materials, in particular) and by the professional staff included in reference and instruction that would be provided by restoration of library staffing to prior levels.

Information Skills

The libraries currently provide instruction in library skills and, to some extent, in other kinds of information skills. The staffing necessary to meet those existing programs will, in my estimation, be adequately met by the restoration of the library programs to prior level. As I have visualized it, though, major augmentation of resources is required to meet increased needs. In particular, I see opportunities in the context of the "information society" and the increasing importance of computer-based information access. Those are beyond the scope of current or restored levels of staffing as well as calling for additional computer equipment and external services (such as database access. To meet this, there is need for at least one additional professional staff person to be responsible for the library/information skills program on each campus, committed full-time to instruction and to coordination of it. There is need for at least one microcomputer per 1000 students on each campus. There is need for programs and instructional software appropriate to the needs, And finally, there is need for contract services for access to databases.

Since there are many uncertainties about the value, the content, the best means for providing increased instruction, etc., the program plan presented is based on a phased approach. First, there should be a year of pilot-test at one campus; then a one year period of extension to two other campuses; then an extension in the remaining two years to the other campuses:

	Current	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1978/89	1989/90
Staffing	$ 40 K	$ 120 K	$ 120 K	$ 200 K	$ 360 K
Acquisitions	40 K	120 K	120 K	40 K	40 K
Automation (and computers)	40 K	120 K	120 K	80 K	40 K
Services	10 K	30 K	30 K	50 K	90 K
Total	$ 130 K	$ 390 K	$ 390 K	$ 370 K	$ 530 K

Student Support

I see no additional resource requirements for this programmatic area.

Internal Operations

The use of automated systems in support of internal library operations is now so much a part of good management that I must assume there should be an automation component in the District's library development program. The following is predicated on the conduct of an automation study, followed by the acquisition of microccomputer equipment and appropriate library-oriented software at each of the nine campuses over the coming five year period. In addition, costs will be incurred in the coversion of files and operations; that will be reflected in temporary staffing requirements.

The decision concerning the feasibility of these developments and the choice among the possible alternatives requires the kind of systems analysi implied by Recommendation 9, listed above. I am assuming that such a systems study could be completed within this academic year (1984/85), so I have projected contract services for that purpose in the current year. Following that, there would be need for acquisition and/or development of software. I have shown that as "contract services" in the subsequent years, though it might simply be represented by the purchase of software packages.

	Current	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1978/89	1989/90
Staffing		$ 20 K	$ 40 K	$ 30 K		
Automation (computers)		$ 40 K	$ 80 K	$ 60 K		
Services	$ 40 K	$ 150 K	$ 100 K	$ 50 K	$ 50 K	$ 50 K
Total	$ 40 K	$ 210 K	$ 220 K	$ 140 K	$ 50 K	$ 50 K

Administrative Organization

There do not seem to be any resource implications associated with the recommended administrative organization.

Summary

The following summarizes the totals for each of the programmatic areas:

	Current	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1978/89	1989/90
Instruction	$1,700 K	$2,300 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K	$2,900 K
Information Skills		$ 130 K	$ 390 K	$ 390 K	$ 370 K	$ 530 K
Internal	$ 40 K	$ 210 K	$ 220 K	$ 140 K	$ 50 K	$ 50 K
Total	$1,740 K	$2,640 K	$3,510 K	$3,430 K	$3,320 K	$3,480 K

And the following summarizes by category of expenditure:

	Current	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88	1978/89	1989/90
Staffing	$1,400 K	$1,660 K	$1,960 K	$1,950 K	$2,000 K	$2,160 K
Acquisitions	300 K	490 K	720 K	720 K	640 K	640 K
Equipment (non-computer)		250 K	500 K	500 K	500 K	500 K
Automation (computers)		$ 80 K	$ 200 K	$ 180 K	$ 80 K	$ 40 K
Services	$ 40 K	$ 160 K	$ 130 K	$ 80 K	$ 100 K	$ 140 K
Total	$1,740 K	$2,640 K	$3,510 K	$3,430 K	$3,320 K	$3,480 K

That is certainly a substantial increase from the current state of the libraries' budgets -- a doubling. However, of that increase, two-thirds is necessited by the need to restore programmatic support in those areas central to the library's mission on each campus -- support to the instructional programs. The remainder is generally the result of the effects of the computer upon the mission and operation of the libraries; in part, it reflects the need to provide instruction in the use of computer for information access and use and, in part, to incorporate appropriate use of automation within the libraries themselves.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
NOV 8 1985